

REMARKS

The foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow are meant to impart precision to the claims, and more particularly point out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. Claims 1-24 were rejected. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended. Claims 8, 16, and 24 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Specification

As requested by the Examiner, Applicant has amended the specification to include reference characters 600 through 626 of Figures 6B and 6C.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,865,599 (“Zhang”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,708,172 (“Wong”). Claims 17-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2002/0133561 (“O’Brien”)

The Prior Art Fails to Disclose: “in response to receiving the excerpt, automatically translating the excerpt into an XML format to be compatible, without further translation, for operation with at least one second information handling system of the user”

As amended, claims 1 and 9 recite, inter alia: “in response to receiving the excerpt, automatically translating the excerpt into an XML format to be compatible, without further translation, for operation with at least one second information handling system of the user”. Claim 17 is substantially similar. The cited prior art fails to teach this claim limitation.

For this claim limitation, the Examiner cited O’Brien at paragraph 88, which merely states: “The XDXML object 242 accepts an object and delivers as output an XML representation of a transaction or status requested by the user or client software.” O’Brien explains that “XDXML” stands for an apparent proprietary format “X: Drive Extensible Markup Language.” (O’Brien, para. 74.) Nothing in this bare excerpt of O’Brien discloses or teaches *automatic* translation, much less translation to an XML format for operation with another information handling system *without the need for further translation*, as claimed. Accordingly,

claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable. The remaining dependent claims are patentable both by their dependence on patentable independent claims and in their own right.

The Prior Art Fails To Teach: “the translated excerpt including a user-specified item of music”

As amended, claims 1 and 9 recite, inter alia: “the translated excerpt including a user-specified item of music”. Claim 17 is substantially similar. The cited prior art fails to teach this claim limitation.

Zhang, which the Examiner cited for this claim limitation, discloses MIME (Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions) types for graphics, audio, and video. (Zhang, col. 5, lines 13-17.) Zhang also discloses an “event object” to be encoded as an XML message, which the Examiner equates with the claim limitation. (Zhang, col. 7, lines 36-37.) However, Zhang goes on to describe an event object as “*the location of the cursor, mouse buttons clicked, keys pressed, and any HTML elements involved in the operation*”. (Zhang, col. 7, lines 29-32.) By its express terms, Zhang fails to disclose or teach that an item of music qualifies as the disclosed event object translated into XML. Accordingly, Zhang fails to teach *an XML translated excerpt including a user-specified item of music*, as claimed. Thus, claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable for this additional reason.

The Prior Art Fails To Teach: “synchronizing the translated excerpt with the second information handling system by communicating with a third information handling system associated with a server, a version of the translated excerpt saved in second personal folder associated with the user of the second information handling system”

As amended, claims 1 and 9 recite, inter alia: “synchronizing the translated excerpt with the second information handling system by communicating with a third information handling system associated with a server, a version of the translated excerpt saved in second personal folder associated with the user of the second information handling system”. Claim 17 is substantially similar. The cited prior art references fail to teach this claim limitation.

As its title suggests, and as confirmed by its disclosure, Zhang teaches a “Browser-to-Browser, DOM-Based, Peer-to-Peer Communication with Delta Synchronization”. Zhang discloses that “contents can be properly synchronized among peers”. (Zhang, col. 5, line 28.) *Peer-to-peer* communication and synchronization is the Zhang system’s focus. Nowhere in

Zhang is there any disclosure of *synchronization* based on a third information handling system *associated with a server*, as claimed.

The Examiner contends that Wong discloses what Zhang fails to disclose. For example, the Examiner cited column 15, lines 51-54, which provides:

A spatial browsing system server in accordance with the present invention performs the following functions: user authentication--validation of end-users; user management--registration, deletion, buddy list management, and proxy management; plot storage--spatial definition and contents; plot management--creation, destruction and re-definition; plot retrieval--retrieval of plot definitions and/or contents based on spatial queries; proxy storage--spatial definition and contents--proxy tracking; proxy retrieval--retrieval of proxy definitions and/or contents based on spatial queries; and messaging--Message storage, forwarding and deletion.

(Wong, col. 18, lines 51-62.) Nothing in the cited portions of Wong describe synchronization at all, much less synchronization of an *XML translated excerpt* with a second information handling system *by using a third information handling system associated with a server*, as claimed.

Furthermore, nothing in the cited prior art discloses that a version of the translated excerpt is saved in a personal folder associated with the user in the second information handling system.

Thus, Zhang and Wong -- either individually or in combination -- do not disclose this claim limitation. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable for this additional reason.

Accordingly, independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable. The dependent claims are patentable both by their dependence on patentable independent claims and in their own right. While Applicants respectfully traverse all of the Examiner's rejections, Applicants submit that the foregoing reasons are sufficient to demonstrate the patentability of the pending claims without further address of any remaining rejections.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-2638 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such an extension.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 14, 2008

/James W. Soong/
James W. Soong
Registration No. 40,824

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
CUSTOMER NUMBER **64494**
1900 University Avenue, Fifth Floor
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Phone: (650) 328-8500
Fax: (650) 328-8508